REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-46 were presented in this application. Claims 16-46 were withdrawn from consideration leaving claims 1-15 pending. In an Official Office Action dated June 5, 2007, claims 1-15 were rejected. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his consideration and addresses the Examiner's comments concerning the claims pending in this application below.

Applicant herein amends claims 1 and 7 and respectfully traverses the Examiner's prior rejections. Claims 16-46 are cancelled without prejudice and no new claims are added. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution and issuance of the application. In making this amendment, the Applicant has not and is not narrowing the scope of the protection to which the Applicant considers the claimed invention to be entitled and does not concede, directly or by implication, that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, the Applicant reserves the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection of Claims

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically the phrase "persistent objects" was deemed indefinite. Accordingly claim 7 has been amended to clearly state that "persistent objects" refers to objects that are consistently used. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,118,158 by Stanton et al. ("Stanton"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in light of the following remarks.

MPEP §2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claims as currently amended recite features lacking in the applied references. For example, independent claim 1 recites, among other things, "a software bus communicatively coupled to a plurality of services and configured to provide common access to each of the plurality of services wherein the software bus and the presentation framework operate independent from each other." Stanton fails to disclose a software bus coupled to a plurality of services that operates independent from a presentation bus.

Before addressing the specific claim language of claim 1 and how it differs from Stanton it may be worthwhile discussing more generally the Applicant's invention as described in the specification and depicted in the application Figures. Prior to the present application, e-commerce platforms were not built on a common extensible platform that can be deployed in a variety of environments. The prior art uses toolkits and suites of e-commerce APIs. Thus the result is a specific solution

or architecture that is limited to a specific marketplace and bound by a single platform.

Both Stanton and the present invention address this failing of the prior art but each do so in a distinct manner. The present invention presents two components that operate independent from one another, a software bus providing access to a plurality of services and a presentation platform providing access to data, and interposed between them exist a variety of extensible modules. This architecture is both flexible and extensible as well as being platform independent (i.e. capable of running enterprise Java beans _and_ servlets).

Stanton appears to present a component based software development system including a component platform with a number of tools and services. This single platform includes a tool and services that enable rapid development of component based systems. Significantly when a component requests a service, the request is formed in XML and thereafter delivered to the computer/component providing such a service.

The present invention precludes such a XML transformation by providing common access to a plurality of services via a software bus. No transformation of a request is required based on the architecture of the present invention.

For at least this reason Stanton does not anticipate claim 1. As claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 they too are deemed non-anticipated by Stanton. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 15 as rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Stanton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,744 by Mikurak ("Mikurak"). Mikurak fails to rectify the deficiencies of Stanton and does not teach or suggest a software bus independent of a presentation platform as recited in claim 1. Reconsideration is requested.

In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 20___

Michael C. Martensen, No. 46,901
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5910 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax